

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/970,436	10/03/2001	Kishor B. Parekh	MCP-0297	5493	
7590 02/08/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Philip S Johnson			HOWARD, SHARON LEE		
One Johnson &	Johnson Plaza				
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/970,436	PAREKH ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sharon L Howard	1615			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2003.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 31-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 31-34 is/are rejected.					
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔯 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 19/12/10/03.		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1615

The examiner acknowledges receipt of the request for continued examination (RCE) and the IDS filed on 12/10/03, and the notice of allowance issue fee due filed on 10/15/03.

Claims 31-34 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31-34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the EP '682 reference.

The patent provides capsule-like medicaments in the form of caplets having a cylindrical shape with a first and a second gelatinous coating and a seam, and teaches that the coating has uniform thickness and the caplets can be supplied in a variety of shapes and sizes (see col.13, lines 13-55). The patent does not specifically disclose the width to thickness ratio of the caplet, however, it teaches that those of ordinary skill I the art could vary the coating thickness to provide a smoother, easier to swallow caplet (see col. 13, lines 40-43). Figures 7 and 8 in the patent show a caplet having a peripheral edge surface that is bowed in shape.

Art Unit: 1615

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of the patent to devise caplets having a peripheral edge surface that is bowed in shape and a defined width to thickness ratio, so that the caplet is smooth and easy to swallow. The expected result would have been a successful caplet. Because of the teachings of the patent, that the thickness of the coating can be varied to provide an easy to swallow caplet, one of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation that the caplets claimed in the instant application would be successful. Therefore the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/10/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that EP '683 neither teaches nor suggests bow-shaped caplets. Figures 7 and 8 of EP '682 do not show bow-shaped caplets. Rather, they show conventional caplets of the kind generally show in Figure 5 of the present application

In response to applicant's argument, the EP '683 reference does suggest the teachings of a bow-shaped caplet (see Fig.7). Figure 7 shows a caplet in which the side of the caplet is bowed. In conclusion, the rejection set forth above is maintained for reasons of record.

No claims are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 09/970,436 Page 4

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon L Howard whose telephone number is (571) 272-0596. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharon Howard February 2, 2005

Shaw Sheward

THURMAN K. PAGE UPERVISORY PASENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600